arXiv:0705.1655v2 [math.CV] 24 Jan 2009

Existence of extremal Beltrami coefficients with nonconstant modulus

GUOWU YAO

ABSTRACT. Suppose $[\mu]_{T(\Delta)}$ is a point of the universal Teichmüller space $T(\Delta)$. In 1998, it was shown by Božin et al. that there exists μ such that μ is uniquely extremal in $[\mu]_{T(\Delta)}$ and has a nonconstant modulus. It is a natural problem whether there is always an extremal Beltrmai coefficient of constant modulus in $[\mu]_{T(\Delta)}$ if $[\mu]_{T(\Delta)}$ admits infinitely many extremal Beltrami coefficients. The purpose of this paper is to show that the answer is negative. An infinitesimal version is also obtained. Extremal sets of extremal Beltrami coefficients are considered and an open problem is proposed.

1. Introduction

Suppose $\mathfrak{D}$ is a Jordan domain in the complex plane $\mathbb{C}$ and $w = f(z)$ be a quasiconformal mapping on $\mathfrak{D}$. The complex dilatation of f is defined by

$$\mu(z) = \frac{f_{\bar{z}}(z)}{f_z(z)},$$

which is also called the Beltrami coefficient of f.

Let $M(\mathfrak{D})$ be the open unit ball of $L^\infty(\mathfrak{D})$. Let z_1, z_2, z_3 be three boundary points on $\partial\mathfrak{D}$. For a given $\mu \in M(\mathfrak{D})$, denote by f^μ the uniquely determined quasiconformal mapping of $\mathfrak{D}$ onto itself with complex dilatation μ and normalized to fix z_1, z_2, z_3. The elements of $M(\mathfrak{D})$ are also called Beltrami coefficients. Two elements μ and ν in $M(\mathfrak{D})$ are Teichmüller equivalent, which is denoted by $\mu \sim \nu$, if $f^\mu|_{\partial\mathfrak{D}} = f^\nu|_{\partial\mathfrak{D}}$. Then $T(\mathfrak{D}) = M(\mathfrak{D})/\sim$ is the Teichmüller space of $\mathfrak{D}$. The equivalence class of the Beltrami coefficient zero is the basepoint of $T(\mathfrak{D})$.

Given $\mu \in M(\mathfrak{D})$, we denote by $[\mu]_{T(\mathfrak{D})}$ the set of all elements $\nu \in M(\mathfrak{D})$ equivalent to μ, and set

$$k(\mu) = \inf\{\|\nu\|_\infty : \nu \in [\mu]\}. \tag{1. 1}$$

We say that μ is extremal (in $[\mu]_{T(\mathfrak{D})}$) if $\|\mu\|_\infty = k(\mu)$, uniquely extremal if $\|\nu\|_\infty > k(\mu)$ for any other $\nu \in [\mu]_{T(\mathfrak{D})}$. Accordingly, f^μ is called extremal (uniquely extremal)

2000 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* Primary 30C75; Secondary 30C62.

Key words and phrases. Teichmüller space, Delta Inequality, Beltrami coefficient, extremal set.

The research was supported by a Foundation for the Author of National Excellent Doctoral Dissertation (Grant No. 200518) of PR China and the National Natural Science Foundation of China.

quasiconformal mapping for its boundary correspondence. Let $[\mu]^*_{T(\mathfrak{D})}$ denote the set of all extremal Beltrami coefficients in $[\mu]_{T(\mathfrak{D})}$.

Throughout the paper, let $A(\mathfrak{D})$ denote the Banach space of all holomorphic functions φ in the domain $\mathfrak{D}$ with L^1-norm

$$\|\varphi\| = \iint_{\mathfrak{D}} |\varphi(z)|dxdy < \infty.$$

Two elements μ and ν in $L^\infty(\mathfrak{D})$ are infinitesimally equivalent, which is denoted by $\mu \approx \nu$, if $\iint_{\mathfrak{D}} \mu\phi dxdy = \iint_{\mathfrak{D}} \nu\phi dxdy$ for all $\phi \in A(\mathfrak{D})$. Denote by $N(\mathfrak{D})$ the set of all the elements in $L^\infty(\mathfrak{D})$ which are infinitesimally equivalent to zero. Then $B(\mathfrak{D}) = L^\infty(\mathfrak{D})/N(\mathfrak{D})$ is the tangent space of the Teichmüller space $T(\mathfrak{D})$ at the basepoint.

Given $\mu \in L^\infty(\mathfrak{D})$, we denote by $[\mu]_{B(\mathfrak{D})}$ the set of all elements $\nu \in L^\infty(\mathfrak{D})$ infinitesimally equivalent to μ, and set

$$\|\mu\|_{B(\mathfrak{D})} = \inf\{\|\nu\|_\infty : \nu \in [\mu]_{B(\mathfrak{D})}\}. \tag{1. 2}$$

We say that μ is extremal (in $[\mu]_{B(\mathfrak{D})}$) if $\|\mu\|_\infty = [\mu]_{B(\mathfrak{D})}$, uniquely extremal if $\|\nu\|_\infty > \|\mu\|_\infty$ for any other $\nu \in [\mu]_{B(\mathfrak{D})}$. μ is also called extremal Beltrami coefficient if it is extremal and $\|\mu\|_\infty < 1$. Similarly, let $[\mu]^*_{B(\mathfrak{D})}$ denote the set of all extremal elements in $[\mu]_{B(\mathfrak{D})}$.

A Beltrami coefficient μ is said to be of constant modulus if it has the form

$$\mu(z) = k\frac{\overline{\varphi(z)}}{|\varphi(z)|}, \tag{1. 3}$$

where $k \in [0, 1)$ is a constant and φ is a complex-valued function in $\mathfrak{D}$ with $\varphi \neq 0$ a.e. Particularly, if $\varphi \not\equiv 0$ is meromorphic in $\mathfrak{D}$, μ is then called a Teichmüller Beltrami coefficient.

Let Δ be the unit disk $\{|z| < 1\}$. In this paper, unless otherwise specified, we restrict the considerations to the special case $\mathfrak{D} = \Delta$ in order to simplify exposition.

For a given point $[\mu]_{T(\Delta)}$ in the universal Teichmüller space $T(\Delta)$, there are two cases for the extremal Beltrami coefficients among $[\mu]_{T(\Delta)}$. One is that there is a unique extremal Beltrami coefficient in $[\mu]_{T(\Delta)}$ which may be of constant modulus or not (ref. [1]). The other is that there are more than one extremal Beltrami coefficient in $[\mu]_{T(\Delta)}$. In the latter case, in fact there are infinitely many extremal Beltrami coefficients in $[\mu]_{T(\Delta)}$ (see [9, 2]). Moreover, in this setting there definitely exists an extremal Beltrami coefficient of nonconstant modulus in $[\mu]_{T(\Delta)}$ (see [7, 11, 12]).

Is there always an extremal Beltrami coefficient of constant modulus in $[\mu]_{T(\Delta)}$ if it contains infinitely many extremal Beltrami coefficients? It is a natural problem (also posed in [12]). The author recently [10] constructed certain $[\mu]_{T(\Delta)}$ admitting infinitely many extremal Beltrami coefficients such that it contains no extremal Teichmüller Beltrami coefficients. Perhaps one still expects that $[\mu]_{T(\Delta)}$ contains at least an extremal Beltrami coefficient of constant modulus. However, the following counterexample theorem gives the converse answer.

Theorem 1. *There exists a point $[\mu]_{T(\Delta)}$ in the universal Teichmüller space $T(\Delta)$ admitting more than one extremal Beltrami coefficient, such that $[\mu]_{T(\Delta)}$ contains no extremal Beltrami coefficients of constant modulus.*

Corollary 1. *There exists some $[\mu]_{T(\Delta)}$ in $T(\Delta)$ admitting more than one extremal Beltrami coefficient, such that $[\mu]_{T(\Delta)}$ contains no extremal Teichmüller Beltrami coefficients.*

We also obtain an infinitesimal version of Theorem 1.

Theorem 2. *There exists a point $[\mu]_{T(\Delta)}$ in $B(\Delta)$ admitting more than one extremal Beltrami coefficient, such that $[\mu]_{T(\Delta)}$ contains no extremal Beltrami coefficients of constant modulus.*

Corollary 2. *There exists some $[\mu]_{B(\Delta)}$ in $B(\Delta)$ admitting more than one extremal Beltrami coefficient, such that $[\mu]_{B(\Delta)}$ contains no extremal Teichmüller Beltrami coefficients.*

Delta Inequalities are introduced in Section 2. Some preparations are done in Section 3. After giving Reich's Construction Theorem and its applications in Section 4, we present the proofs of our main results in Section 5. At the end, we consider the extremal sets of extremal Beltrami coefficients and pose an open problem.

The results as well as the method used here can be extended to more general hyperbolic Riemann surfaces and their Teichmüller spaces.

2 . Delta Inequalities

For $\mu \in L^\infty(\Delta)$, $\phi \in A(\Delta)$, let

$$\Lambda_\mu[\phi] = \iint_\Delta \mu(z)\phi(z)dxdy, \quad \lambda_\mu[\phi] = Re\Lambda_\mu[\phi]. \tag{2. 1}$$

The functional $\delta = \delta_\mu$ is defined on Δ by

$$\delta(\varphi) = \|\mu\|_\infty \|\varphi\| - \lambda_\mu[\varphi], \quad \varphi \in A(\Delta).$$

We say that $\mu \in L^\infty(\Delta)$ satisfies Reich's condition on a set $E \subset \Delta$ if there exists a sequence φ_n in $A(\Delta)$ so that $\delta(\varphi_n) \to 0$ and $\liminf |\varphi_n(z)| > 0$ for almost all z in E. Meanwhile, $\varphi_n(z)$ is called a Reich's condition sequence for μ on E.

Remark 1. A Reich's condition sequence is also called a Delta sequence which was first introduced in [5].

As is well known, a necessary and sufficient condition (Hamilton-Krushkal-Reich-Strebel condition) that a quasiconformal mapping f is extremal (for its boundary values) is that [8] its Beltrami coefficient μ has a so-called Hamilton sequence, namely, a sequence $\{\phi_n \in A(\Delta) : \|\phi_n\| = 1, n \in \mathbb{N}\}$, such that

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} \Lambda_\mu[\phi_n] = \lim_{n\to\infty} \iint_\Delta \mu\phi_n(z)dxdy = \|\mu\|_\infty. \tag{2. 2}$$

Now, we introduce Reich's Delta Inequality and Infinitesimal Delta Inequality on the unit disk Δ. Their generalized forms play important roles in the joint work [1] of Božin et al.

Suppose that μ and ν are two equivalent Beltrami coefficients in the universal Teichmüller space $T(\Delta)$. Let $\widetilde{\mu}$ and $\widetilde{\nu}$ be the Beltrami coefficients of the quasiconformal mappings f^{-1} and g^{-1} respectively, where $f = f^{\mu}$ and $g = f^{\nu}$.

Delta Inequality. *If μ and ν are equivalent Beltrami coefficients in $T(\Delta)$ with*

$$\|\nu\|_\infty \le k = \|\mu\|_\infty < 1,$$

then

$$\iint_\Delta \left|\frac{\widetilde{\mu}(f) - \widetilde{\nu}(f)}{1 - \overline{\widetilde{\mu}(f)}\widetilde{\nu}(f)}\right|^2 |\varphi| \le C(k\|\varphi\| - Re \iint_\Delta \mu\varphi), \tag{2. 3}$$

for all φ in $A(\Delta)$. The constant C depends only on $k = \|\mu\|_\infty$.

Infinitesimal Delta Inequality. *There exists a universal constant C such that for every pair of infinitesimally equivalent Beltrami coefficients μ and ν with*

$$\|\nu\|_\infty \le \|\mu\|_\infty < \infty,$$

we have

$$\iint_\Delta |\mu - \nu|^2 |\varphi| \le C\|\mu\|_\infty (\|\mu\|_\infty \|\varphi\| - Re \iint_\Delta \mu\varphi), \tag{2. 4}$$

for all φ in $A(\Delta)$. The constant C is independent of μ and ν.

3. Some preparations

Let $\mathfrak{J}_i \subsetneqq \Delta$ $(i = 1, 2, \dots, m)$ be m $(m \in \mathbb{N})$ Jordan domains such that $\overline{\mathfrak{J}_i}$ $(i = 1, 2, \dots, m)$ are mutually disjoint and $\Delta \backslash \cup_1^m \overline{\mathfrak{J}_i}$ is connected. Let μ be a Beltrami coefficient in $M(\Delta)$. Let $T(\mathfrak{J}_i)$ be the Teichmüller space of $\mathfrak{J}_i$ respectively.

Lemma 1. *Let $\mathfrak{J}_i \subsetneqq \Delta$ $(i = 1, 2, \dots, m)$ be given as above and let $\mathfrak{J} = \cup_1^m \mathfrak{J}_i$. Let μ and ν be two equivalent Beltrami coefficients in $T(\Delta)$. In addition, suppose $\mu(z) = \nu(z)$ for almost every $z \in \Delta \backslash \overline{\mathfrak{J}}$. Then, $f^{\mu}(z) = f^{\nu}(z)$ for all z in $\Delta \backslash \mathfrak{J}$ and hence $f^{\mu}(\overline{\mathfrak{J}}) = f^{\nu}(\overline{\mathfrak{J}})$.*

Proof. For the sake of convenience, let $f = f^{\mu}$ and $g = f^{\nu}$. Let $\mu_{g \circ f^{-1}}(w)$ denote the Beltrami coefficient of $g \circ f^{-1}$. By a simple computation, we have

$$\mu_{g \circ f^{-1}} \circ f(z) = \frac{1}{\tau} \frac{\mu(z) - \nu(z)}{1 - \overline{\mu(z)}\nu(z)}, \tag{3. 1}$$

where $\tau = \overline{f_z}/f_z$.

Thus, $\mu_{g \circ f^{-1}}(w) = 0$ for almost all $w \in f(\Delta \backslash \overline{\mathfrak{J}})$ and hence $\Psi = g \circ f^{-1}$ is conformal on $\Delta \backslash \overline{\mathfrak{J}}$. Since $\Psi|_{S^1} = g \circ f^{-1}|_{S^1} = id$, we conclude that $\Psi = id$ in $f(\Delta \backslash \mathfrak{J})$. Furthermore, we conclude that $\Psi|_{f(\partial \mathfrak{J})} = id$ by the continuity of quasiconformal mappings. Thus, $g|_{\Delta \backslash \mathfrak{J}} = f|_{\Delta \backslash \mathfrak{J}}$, which evidently gives the theorem. □

From Lemma 1, we easily obtain

Lemma 2. *Let $\mathfrak{J}_i$ $(i = 1, 2, \ldots, m)$ and $\mathfrak{J}$ be given as above. Suppose that $\mu(z)$ is a Beltrami coefficient in $M(\Delta)$. Let $\nu(z)$ be an other Beltrami coefficient in $M(\Delta)$ defined as follows*

$$\nu(z) = \begin{cases} \mu(z), & z \in \Delta \backslash \mathfrak{J}, \\ \beta_i(z), & z \in \mathfrak{J}_i,\ i = 1, 2, \ldots, m, \end{cases}$$

where $\beta_i(z) \in M(\mathfrak{J}_i)$ $(i = 1, 2, \ldots, m)$. Then the following three conditions are equivalent:
(a) $[\mu]_{T(\Delta)} = [\nu]_{T(\Delta)}$,
(b) $[\mu_i]_{T(\mathfrak{J}_i)} = [\beta_i]_{T(\mathfrak{J}_i)}$, where μ_i is the restriction of μ on $\mathfrak{J}_i$ $(i = 1, 2, \ldots, m)$,
(c) $f^\mu(z) = f^\nu(z)$ for all z on $\cup_1^m \partial \mathfrak{J}_i$.

Proof. (a)$\Longrightarrow$(c): It is a direct corollary of Lemma 1.
(c)$\Longrightarrow$(b): It follows from the definition of Teichmüller equivalence class.
(b)$\Longrightarrow$(a): Let $f^\mu|_{\mathfrak{J}} : \mathfrak{J} \to f^\mu(\mathfrak{J})$ be the restriction of f^μ on $\mathfrak{J}$. Since $[\mu_i]_{T(\mathfrak{J}_i)} = [\beta_i]_{T(\mathfrak{J}_i)}$, by the definition of Teichmüller equivalence class and Riemann Mapping Theorem, there exists a quasiconformal mapping g_i from $\mathfrak{J}_i$ onto $f^\mu(\mathfrak{J}_i)$ such that the Beltrami coefficient μ_{g_i} of g_i is $\beta_i(z)$ on $\mathfrak{J}_i$ $(i = 1, 2, \ldots, m)$, which implies (a). □

To obtain Theorem 2, we also need an infinitesimal version of Lemma 2.

Lemma 3. *Let $\mathfrak{J}_i$ $(i = 1, 2, \ldots, m)$ and $\mathfrak{J}$ be given as above. Suppose that $\mu(z)$ is a Beltrami coefficient in $M(\Delta)$. Let $\nu(z)$ be an other Beltrami coefficient in $M(\Delta)$ defined as follows*

$$\nu(z) = \begin{cases} \mu(z), & z \in \Delta \backslash \mathfrak{J}, \\ \beta_i(z), & z \in \mathfrak{J}_i,\ i = 1, 2, \ldots, m, \end{cases}$$

where $\beta_i(z) \in M(\mathfrak{J}_i)$ $(i = 1, 2, \ldots, m)$. Then the following two conditions are equivalent:
(a) $[\mu]_{B(\Delta)} = [\nu]_{B(\Delta)}$,
(b) $[\mu_i]_{B(\mathfrak{J}_i)} = [\beta_i]_{B(\mathfrak{J}_i)}$, where μ_i is the restriction of μ on $\mathfrak{J}_i$ $(i = 1, 2, \ldots, m)$.

Before proving Lemma 3, we introduce Lemma 5 of [1] as

Lemma 4. *Let $\mathfrak{D} \subset \Delta$ be a subdomain such that $\overline{\mathfrak{D}} \subset \Delta$ and $\Delta - \overline{\mathfrak{D}}$ is connected and dense in $\Delta - \mathfrak{D}$. Then the restrictions to $\mathfrak{D}$ of quadratic differentials in $A(\Delta)$ are dense in $A(\mathfrak{D})$.*

Proof of Lemma 3: It is evident that (b) implies (a). We only need to show that (a) implies (b). If (a) holds, then for any $\varphi \in A(\Delta)$,

$$\iint_\Delta \mu\varphi = \iint_\Delta \nu\varphi.$$

Because $\mu(z)=\nu(z)$ for $z\in\Delta\backslash\mathfrak{J}$, we have

$$\iint_{\cup_1^m\mathfrak{J}_i}\mu\varphi=\iint_{\mathfrak{J}_1}\mu_1\varphi+\sum_{i=2}^m\iint_{\mathfrak{J}_i}\mu_i\varphi=\iint_{\mathfrak{J}_1}\beta_1\varphi+\sum_{i=2}^m\iint_{\mathfrak{J}_i}\beta_i\varphi. \tag{3. 2}$$

Applying Runge's theorem to $\overline{\mathfrak{J}_i}$ $(i=1,2,\dots,m)$, there exists a polynomial sequence $\{\psi_n\}$ such that

$$\lim_{n\to\infty}\iint_{\mathfrak{J}_i}|\psi_n-\varphi|=0,\ i=2,\dots,m,$$

and

$$\lim_{n\to\infty}\iint_{\mathfrak{J}_1}|\psi_n|=0,\ i=1.$$

Notice that

$$\iint_{\mathfrak{J}_1}\mu_1(\varphi-\psi_n)+\sum_{i=2}^m\iint_{\mathfrak{J}_i}\mu_i(\varphi-\psi_n)=\iint_{\mathfrak{J}_1}\beta_1(\varphi-\psi_n)+\sum_{i=2}^m\iint_{\mathfrak{J}_i}\beta_i(\varphi-\psi_n). \tag{3. 3}$$

Taking the limit on the two side of the above equality, we get

$$\iint_{\mathfrak{J}_1}\mu_1\varphi=\iint_{\mathfrak{J}_1}\beta_1\varphi. \tag{3. 4}$$

Furthermore, by Lemma 4, for any $\phi\in A(\mathfrak{J}_1)$,

$$\iint_{\mathfrak{J}_1}\mu_1\phi=\iint_{\mathfrak{J}_1}\beta_1\phi.$$

Namely, $[\mu_1]_{B(\mathfrak{J}_1)}=[\beta_1]_{B(\mathfrak{J}_1)}$. Similarly, $[\mu_i]_{B(\mathfrak{J}_i)}=[\beta_i]_{B(\mathfrak{J}_i)}$ $(i=2,\dots,m)$. Thus, the proof of Lemma 3 is completed.

4. Construction Theorem and its applications

The following Construction Theorem is essentially the same as that of Reich's Construction Theorem [6].

Construction Theorem. *Let A be a compact subset of Δ consisting of m $(m\in\mathbb{N})$ connected components and such that each connected component contains at least two points. There exists a function $\alpha\in L^\infty(\Delta)$ and a sequence $\varphi_n\in A(\Delta)$ $(n=1,2,\dots)$ satisfying the following conditions (4. 1) – (4. 4):*

$$|\alpha(z)|=\begin{cases}0, & z\in A,\\ 1, & \textit{for a.a. } z\in\Delta\backslash A,\end{cases} \tag{4. 1}$$

$$\lim_{n\to\infty}\{\|\varphi_n\|-\lambda_\alpha[\varphi_n]\}=0, \tag{4. 2}$$

$$\lim_{n\to\infty}|\varphi_n(z)|=\infty\quad \textit{a.e. in } \Delta\backslash A. \tag{4. 3}$$

and as $n\to\infty$,

$$\varphi_n(z)\to 0 \textit{ uniformly on } A. \tag{4. 4}$$

Proof. Reich's Construction Theorem [6] gives the theorem when $m = 1$. For simplicity and without loss of generality, we assume $m = 2$. Thus, since A is compact and has two connected components, $\Delta\backslash A$ is triply connected. Let X and Y denote two connected components of A.

Let $\{J_n\}$, $\{X_n\}$ and $\{Y_n\}$ be closed Jordan domains with the following properties:

$$J_n \subset \Delta,\ J_n \subset Int(J_{n+1}),\ X_n \subset \Delta,\ X_{n+1} \subset Int(X_n),\ Y_n \subset \Delta,$$

$$Y_{n+1} \subset Int(Y_n),\ J_n \cap X_n = \varnothing,\ J_n \cap Y_n = \varnothing,\ X_n \cap Y_n = \varnothing,$$

$$|\bigcup_1^\infty J_n| = |\Delta\backslash A|,\ \bigcap_1^\infty X_n = X,\ \bigcap_1^\infty Y_n = Y.$$

The rest proof takes word by word from Reich's. In addition, equation (4. 4) is implied in his proof.

□

Combining the Construction Theorem and Lemma 1, we get

Lemma 5. *Let $\mathfrak{J}_i \subsetneqq \Delta$ $(i = 1, 2, \ldots, m)$ be m Jordan domains such that $\overline{\mathfrak{J}_i}$ $(i = 1, 2, \ldots, m)$ are mutually disjoint and $\Delta\backslash \cup_1^m \overline{\mathfrak{J}_i}$ is connected. Let $A = \cup_1^m \overline{\mathfrak{J}_i}$. Suppose $\alpha(z)$ and the sequence $\varphi_n \in A(\Delta)$ be constructed by the Construction Theorem and let $\mu(z) = k\alpha(z)$ where $k < 1$ is a positive constant. Set*

$$\nu(z) = \begin{cases} \mu(z), & z \in \Delta\backslash A, \\ \beta_i(z), & z \in \mathfrak{J}_i,\ i = 1, 2, \ldots, m, \end{cases}$$

where $\beta_i(z)$ is in $M(\mathfrak{J}_i)$ with $\|\beta_i\|_\infty \le k$ $(i = 1, 2, \ldots, m)$. Then

(1) $\nu(z)$ is extremal in $[\nu]_{T(\Delta)}$ and for any $\chi(z)$ in $[\nu]^*_{T(\Delta)}$, $\chi(z) = \nu(z)$ for almost all z in $\Delta\backslash A$;

(2) $\nu(z)$ is extremal in $[\nu]_{B(\Delta)}$ and for any $\chi(z)$ in $[\nu]^*_{B(\Delta)}$, $\chi(z) = \nu(z)$ for almost all z in $\Delta\backslash A$.

Proof. Obviously, $\|\mu\|_\infty = \|\nu\|_\infty = k$. Set $E = \Delta\backslash A$. Notice that the sequence $\varphi_n(z)$ satisfies the conditions (4. 2) (4. 3) and (4. 4). We have

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} \iint_A |\varphi_n(z)| dxdy = 0$$

and hence

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} \iint_A \beta(z)\varphi_n(z) dxdy = 0.$$

Furthermore, by

$$k \iint_E |\varphi_n(z)| dxdy - Re \iint_E \mu(z)\varphi_n(z) dxdy \le \|\varphi_n\| - \lambda_\alpha[\varphi_n],$$

we achieve

$$\begin{aligned}&\lim_{n\to\infty}(k\iint_{\Delta}|\varphi_n(z)|dxdy-Re\iint_{\Delta}\nu(z)\varphi_n(z)dxdy)\\&=\lim_{n\to\infty}(k\iint_{E}|\varphi_n(z)|dxdy-Re\iint_{E}\mu(z)\varphi_n(z)dxdy)\\&+\lim_{n\to\infty}(k\iint_{A}|\varphi_n(z)|dxdy-Re\iint_{A}\beta(z)\varphi_n(z)dxdy)=0.\end{aligned}$$

In short,

$$\lim_{n\to\infty}(k\|\varphi_n\|-\lambda_\nu[\varphi_n])=0. \tag{4. 5}$$

Thus, by equation (4. 3) and Fatou's lemma,

$$k-Re\iint_{\Delta}\nu(z)\frac{\varphi_n(z)}{\|\varphi_n\|}\longrightarrow 0,\ n\to\infty,$$

which shows that $\nu(z)$ is extremal in $[\nu]_{T(\Delta)}$ and hence is extremal in $[\nu]_{B(\Delta)}$.

(1) Assume that $\chi(z)$ is extremal in $[\nu]_{T(\Delta)}$, i.e. $\chi(z)\in[\nu]^*_{T(\Delta)}$. Let $\widetilde{\nu}(w)$, $\widetilde{\chi}(w)$ denote the Beltrami coefficients of $(f^\nu)^{-1}$ and $(f^\chi)^{-1}$ respectively. We claim that $\widetilde{\nu}(f^\nu(z))=\widetilde{\chi}(f^\nu(z))$ for almost every $z\in\Delta\backslash A$. Suppose to the contrary. Then there would exist $\epsilon>0$ and a compact subset S of $\Delta\backslash A$ with positive Lebesgue measure such that $|\frac{\widetilde{\nu}(f^\nu)-\widetilde{\chi}(f^\nu)}{1-\overline{\widetilde{\nu}(f^\nu)}\widetilde{\chi}(f^\nu)}|\geq\epsilon>0$ on S. Then, by the Delta Inequality (2. 3) there exists a positive constant C depending only on k such that

$$\iint_{\Delta}|\frac{\widetilde{\nu}(f^\nu)-\widetilde{\chi}(f^\nu)}{1-\overline{\widetilde{\nu}(f^\nu)}\widetilde{\chi}(f^\nu)}|^2|\varphi_n|\leq C(k\|\varphi_n\|-Re\iint_{\Delta}\nu\varphi_n), \tag{4. 6}$$

Therefore,

$$\frac{\epsilon^2}{4}\iint_{S}|\varphi_n|\leq C(k\|\varphi_n\|-Re\iint_{\Delta}\nu\varphi_n)=C(k\|\varphi_n\|-\lambda_\nu[\varphi_n]). \tag{4. 7}$$

The left of the above inequality has a positive lower bound by (4. 3) and Fatou's lemma while the right tends to 0 as $n\to\infty$ by (4. 5). This contradiction induces our claim.

Applying Lemma 1 to $\widetilde{\mathfrak{J}}=f^\nu(\cup_1^m\mathfrak{J}_i)$ on the target unit disk, we find that $(f^\nu)^{-1}(w)=(f^\chi)^{-1}(w)$ for all w in $f^\nu(\overline{E})$ and $(f^\nu)^{-1}(\widetilde{\mathfrak{J}})=(f^\chi)^{-1}(\widetilde{\mathfrak{J}})$. In other words, $f^\nu(z)=f^\chi(z)$ for all z in $\overline{E}$. Therefore, $\nu(z)=\chi(z)$ for almost every z in $\overline{E}$.

(2) Applying the Infinitesimal Delta Inequality, one easily shows that $\nu(z)$ is extremal in $[\nu]_{B(\Delta)}$ and for any $\chi(z)$ in $[\nu]^*_{B(\Delta)}$, $\chi(z)=\nu(z)$ for almost all z in $\Delta\backslash A$. We skip the details here. □

5. Proof of the main results

To prove our main results, it suffices to construct $\mu\in M(\Delta)$ such that $[\mu]^*_{T(\Delta)}$ or $[\nu]^*_{B(\Delta)}$ contains more than one extremal Beltrami coefficient and contains no extremal Beltrami coefficients of constant modulus.

Proof of Theorem 1: Suppose $m \geq 2$. Let $\mathfrak{J}_i$ $(i = 1, 2, \ldots, m)$ be given as in Lemma 5. Choose $A = \cup_1^m \overline{\mathfrak{J}_i}$. Let $\alpha(z)$ and the sequence $\varphi_n \in A(\Delta)$ be constructed by the Construction Theorem and let $\mu(z) = k\alpha(z)$ where $k < 1$ is a positive constant.

By the Counterexample Theorem in [1] (or see [6]), there exists a Beltrami coefficient $\beta_1(z)$ in $M(\mathfrak{J}_1)$ with $\|\beta_1\|_\infty = k$ such that β_1 is uniquely extremal in $[\beta_1]_{T(\mathfrak{J}_1)}$ and $|\beta_1|$ is not a.e. constant on $\mathfrak{J}_1$. Now, set

$$\nu(z) = \begin{cases} \mu(z), & z \in \Delta - \cup_1^m \mathfrak{J}_i, \\ \beta_1(z), & z \in \mathfrak{J}_1, \\ \beta_i(z), & z \in \mathfrak{J}_i, \quad 1 < i \leq m, \end{cases} \tag{5. 1}$$

where $\beta_2(z) \in M(\mathfrak{J}_2)$ is chosen with $\|\beta_2\|_\infty < k$ and $\beta_i(z) \in M(\mathfrak{J}_i)$ with $\|\beta_i\|_\infty \leq k$ $(i \neq 1, 2)$. Then $\nu(z)$ is extremal in $[\nu]_{T(\Delta)}$ in virtue of Lemma 5 but is not uniquely extremal for $\|\beta_2\|_\infty < k$ on $\mathfrak{J}_2$.

We continue to show that $[\nu]_{T(\Delta)}$ contains no extremal Beltrami coefficients of constant modulus. Suppose $\gamma(z) \in [\nu]_{T(\Delta)}$ is extremal. Then $|\gamma(z)| \leq k$ for almost all z in Δ.

On the other hand, combining Lemma 5 and Lemma 2, we have

$$[\beta_1]_{T(\mathfrak{J}_1)} = [\gamma|_{\mathfrak{J}_1}]_{T(\mathfrak{J}_1)},$$

where $\gamma|_{\mathfrak{J}_1}$ is the restriction of γ on $\mathfrak{J}_1$.

Notice that β_1 is uniquely extremal in $[\beta_1]_{T(\mathfrak{J}_1)}$ with $\|\beta_1\|_\infty = k$ and $|\beta_1|$ is not a.e. constant on $\mathfrak{J}_1$. We find $\gamma(z) = \beta_1(z)$ for almost all $z \in \mathfrak{J}_1$. Thus, we prove, for any $\gamma(z)$ extremal in $[\nu]_{T(\Delta)}$, $|\gamma|$ is not a.e. constant on $\mathfrak{J}_1$.

This completes the proof of Theorem 1.

Proof of Theorem 2: For simplicity we use the same denotations as in the proof of Theorem 1. We only need to show $[\nu]_{B(\Delta)}$ satisfies the requirement of Theorem 2, where $\nu(z)$ is constructed by (5. 1).

It follows that ν is extremal in $[\nu]^*_{B(\Delta)}$ from Lemma 5 and is not uniquely extremal by the Equivalence Theorem in [1]. Suppose $\gamma(z) \in [\nu]_{B(\Delta)}$ is extremal. Then $|\gamma(z)| \leq k$ for almost all z in Δ.

Because β_1 is uniquely extremal in $[\beta_1]_{T(\mathfrak{J}_1)}$ with $\|\beta_1\|_\infty = k$, β_1 is uniquely extremal in $[\beta_1]_{B(\mathfrak{J}_1)}$ again by the Equivalence Theorem.

On the other hand, combining Lemma 5 and Lemma 3, we have

$$[\beta_1]_{B(\mathfrak{J}_1)} = [\gamma|_{\mathfrak{J}_1}]_{B(\mathfrak{J}_1)},$$

where $\gamma|_{\mathfrak{J}_1}$ is the restriction of γ on $\mathfrak{J}_1$. We again find that $\gamma(z) = \beta_1(z)$ for almost all $z \in \mathfrak{J}_1$. Notice that $|\beta_1|$ is not a.e. constant on $\mathfrak{J}_1$. Thus, we prove, for any $\gamma(z)$ extremal in $[\nu]_{B(\Delta)}$, $|\gamma|$ is not a.e. constant on $\mathfrak{J}_1$. Namely, $[\nu]_{B(\Delta)}$ contains no extremal Beltrami coefficients of constant modulus. The proof of Theorem 2 is completed.

We do not know whether there is some essential relation between $[\mu]_{T(\Delta)}$ and $[\mu]_{B(\Delta)}$ if $[\mu]_{T(\Delta)}$ or $[\mu]_{B(\Delta)}$ contains an extremal Beltrami coefficient of constant modulus. The following problem might be interesting.

Problem 1. *Suppose μ is an extremal Beltrami coefficient. If $[\mu]_{T(\Delta)}$ contains an extremal Beltrami coefficient of constant modulus, does it imply that $[\mu]_{B(\Delta)}$ does also? What about the converse?*

Remark 2. Recently, Fan J. and Chen J. [3] gave a negative answer to the above problem in virtue of the method used in this paper.

6. On the measure of extremal sets

Suppose μ is an extremal Beltrami coefficient. For any η extremal in $[\mu]_{T(\Delta)}$ (or $[\mu]_{B(\Delta)}$), let $X[\eta]=\{z\in\Delta:\ |\eta(z)|=\|\mu\|_\infty\}$. We call $X[\eta]$ the extremal set of η.

Suppose ν is constructed as (5. 1) in the proof of Theorem 1. Let $l=mes(X|_{\mathfrak{J}_1}[\beta_1])$ be the Lebesgue measure of the extremal set $X|_{\mathfrak{J}_1}[\beta_1]=\{z\in\mathfrak{J}_1:\ |\beta_1(z)|=\|\beta_1\|_\infty=k\}$. Thus, in virtue of the proof of Theorem 1 (or Theorem 2), for any extremal Beltrami coefficient η in $[\nu]_{T(\Delta)}$ (or $[\nu]_{B(\Delta)}$), $X[\eta]$ satisfies

$$l+\pi-\sum_{i=1}^{m} mes(\mathfrak{J}_i)\le mes(X[\eta])\le l+\pi-mes(\mathfrak{J}_1).$$

Therefore, we have proved

Corollary 3. *Suppose s, $t\in[0,\pi]$ are two arbitrarily given constants with $s<t$, then there exists $[\mu]_{T(\Delta)}\in T(\Delta)$ (or $B(\Delta)$) such that $[\mu]^*_{T(\Delta)}$ ($[\mu]^*_{B(\Delta)}$) contains infinitely many elements and for any $\eta\in[\mu]^*_{T(\Delta)}$ (or $[\mu]^*_{B(\Delta)}$), $s\le mes(X[\eta])\le t$.*

Corollary 3 actually solves two problems about the measure of extremal sets posed in [12]. Naturally, it is interesting for us to consider the special case that the extremal sets of all elements in $[\mu]^*_{T(\Delta)}$ ($[\mu]^*_{B(\Delta)}$) have the same measure. Precisely, we pose

Problem 2. *Suppose for any extremal Beltrami coefficient η in $[\mu]_{T(\Delta)}$ (or $[\mu]_{B(\Delta)}$), $mes(X[\eta])=s$, where $s\in[0,\pi]$ is a constant. Whether does it imply that $[\mu]^*_{T(\Delta)}$ (or $[\mu]^*_{B(\Delta)}$) contains only one element (i.e., uniquely extremal one)?*

If $[\mu]_{T(\Delta)}$ ($[\mu]_{B(\Delta)}$) contains infinitely many extremal Beltrami coefficients, then there exists at least an extremal Beltrami coefficient in $[\mu]_{T(\Delta)}$ ($[\mu]_{B(\Delta)}$) with nonconstant modulus. Considering from the Acknowledgement, this result is actually due to Reich [7], and it was explicitly expressed in [12] again. A similar discussion related to the result was given by Marković and Mateljević in [4]. It was proved for the case of more general hyperbolic Riemann surfaces in [11] recently. Thus, we have an affirmative answer to Problem 2 when $s=\pi$, the rest case of which is open. We further believe that, in the setting of being non-uniquely extremal, $[\mu]_{T(\Delta)}$ ($[\mu]_{B(\Delta)}$) contains infinitely many extremal coefficients with nonconstant modulus; moreover, if $[\mu]_{T(\Delta)}$ ($[\mu]_{B(\Delta)}$) admits an extremal with constant modulus, then admits infinitely many. However, we get no proof up to present.

Acknowledgement. The author would like to express gratitude to the referee for his valuable comments. Thanks are also due to Professor Edgar Reich for his carefully reading this paper and giving useful suggestions concerning this paper.

References

1. V. Božin, N. Lakic and V. Marković and M. Mateljević, *Unique extremality,* J. Anal. Math. 75 (1998), 299-338.
2. C. J. Earle and N. Lakic, *Variability sets on Riemann surfaces and forgetful maps between Teichmüller spaces,* Ann. Acad. Sci. Fenn. Math. 27 (2002), 307-324.
3. J. Fan and J. Chen, *On the equivalence of extremal Teichmüller mapping,* Sci. China Ser. A, Mathematics, to appear.
4. V. Mateljević and V. Marković, *The unique extremal QC mapping and uniqueness of Hanh-Banach extensions,* Mat. Vesnik 48 (1996), 107-112.
5. E. Reich, *A criterion for unique extremality of Teichmüller mappings,* Indiana Univ. Math. J. 30 (1981), 441-447.
6. E. Reich, *The unique extremality counterexample,* J. Anal. Math. 75 (1998), 339-347.
7. E. Reich, *Non-uniquely extremal quasiconformal mappings,* Libertas Mathematica, 20 (2000), 33-38.
8. E. Reich and K. Strebel, *Extremal quasiconformal mappings with given boundary values,* Contributions to Analysis, A Collection of Papers Dedicated to Lipman Bers, Academic Press, New York, 1974, pp. 375-391.
9. K. Strebel, *Point shift differentials and extremal quasiconformal mappings,* Ann. Acad. Sci. Fenn. Math. 23 (1998), 475-494.
10. G. W. Yao, *Is there always an extremal Teichmüller mapping?* J. Anal. Math. 94 (2004), 363-375.
11. G. W. Yao and Y. Qi, *On the modulus of extremal Beltrami coefficients*, J. Math. Kyoto Univ. 46 (2006), 235-247.
12. Z. Zhou, J. Chen and Z. Yang, *On the extremal sets of extremal quasiconformal mappings,* Sci. China Ser. A, Mathematics, 46 (2003), 552-561.

Guowu Yao
Department of Mathematical Sciences
Tsinghua University
Beijing, 100084
People's Republic of China
e-mail: `gwyao@math.tsinghua.edu.cn`